REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.)   Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claim 19. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-12 and 19-22 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.)   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood *et al.* (US 5,708,780) in view of Yoshino *et al.* and further in view of Zilliacus, *et al.* (US 6,915,272). In response, the Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In regards to claim 1, Claim 1 recites receiving <u>a second authentication request at the authentication server from the database server</u> wherein the second authentication request includes the first key provided by the authentication server to the mobile station and a particular data identifying the information to which the mobile station is requesting access.

In rejecting claims 1-5 and 7, the Examiner cites column 3, line 21 through column 4, line 23 for disclosing "receiving a second authentication request at an authentication server from said database server." The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization. In a careful review of Levergood, Levergood clearly does not disclose this limitation. Levergood discloses a client requesting information from an Internet server. The Internet server conducts an authorization prior to issuing a session identification (SID). To perform this authentication, the Internet server redirects the client to an authentication server. The Authentication server returns a response to interrogate the client and issues an SID to a qualified client (Col. 3, lines 21-43). Levergood does not teach or suggest sending a second authentication request from one server to the authentication server. Levergood merely discloses redirecting a client from one server to an authentication where the authentication server provides an authorization to access information in the Internet server.

On the other hand, the Applicant's invention performs several steps between a mobile station, a database server and an authentication server not disclosed in any of the cited references. In the Applicant's claimed invention, the mobile station provides a first authentication request to an authentication server. The authentication server then provides the mobile station a first key. The authentication server also receives a second authentication request from the database server. The authentication server determines whether the mobile station has the authorization to access the database record. The authentication server, in response to an affirmative determination, sends a second key enabling the mobile station to decrypt the information. Thus, the Applicant's invention performs several steps not disclosed in Levergood. Specifically, Levergood does not perform two authentication requests where one of the authentication requests is between the database and the authentication server.

In regards to independent claim 8, claim 8 recites, in response to receiving a request, transmitting an authentication request from the database server to the authentication server. As discussed above, Levergood does not teach or suggest sending an authentication request from one server to the authentication server. Levergood merely discloses redirecting a client from one server to an authentication server where the authentication server provides an authorization to access information in the Internet server.

Claim 19 also recites similar limitations to claim 1 and 8. Claim 19 recites a means for transmitting an authentication request from the database server to the authentication server in response to a request for information. Levergood does not teach or suggest this limitation.

The addition of Yoshino and Zilliacus does not make up these missing elements. Therefore, the combination of Levergood, Yoshino and Zilliacus do not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 8. Claim 20 depends from

claim 19 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 19. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1-5, 7-9, and 19-20 is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood et al., Yoshino et al. and Zilliacus, *et al.* and further in view of Takamoto (US 20020108060). In response, the Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, Levergood does not teach or suggest sending a second authentication request from one server to the authentication server. Levergood merely discloses redirecting a client from one server to an authentication where the authentication server provides an authorization to access information in the Internet server.

The addition of Yoshino, Zilliacus and Takamoto do not make up the missing elements. Therefore, the cited references do not teach or suggest all the elements of the Applicant's claimed invention. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claim 12 depends from claim 8 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 8. Therefore, the allowance of claims 6 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-11 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood, Yoshino, and Zilliacus in view of Dang (US 20030101113) and further in view of Hongo (US 20020049912). In response, the Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Levergood does not teach or suggest sending a second authentication request from one server to the authentication server. Levergood merely discloses redirecting a client from one server to an authentication where the authentication server provides an authorization to access information in the Internet server.

The addition of Yoshino, Zilliacus, Dang and Hongo do not make up the missing elements. Therefore, the cited references do not teach or suggest all the elements of the Applicant's claimed invention. Claims 10 and 11 depends from claim 8 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 8. Claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 19 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel

elements of claim 19.　　Therefore, the allowance of claims 10-11 and 21-22 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance.　The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael Cameron, #50,298/

Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Date: April 12, 2007

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com